UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,582	12/21/2000	Bruce Arland Rich	AUS9-1999-0752-US1	1599

7590 08/06/2004

Barry S. Newberger
Winstead Sechrest & Minick P.C.
5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75270

EXAMINER	
HUA, LY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	7

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/746,582	RICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ly V. Hua	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> . The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. With regard to claim 1:
   i It is not clear as to what is being a purpose of the method presented in claim 1.
      (1) Notice that the preamble does not set forth the goal for which the method is performed.

b. With regard to claim 2:
   i This claim depends on claim 1 and thus inherits the problem of indefiniteness therefrom.

c. With regard to claim 3:
   i It is not clear as to where (relative to the other steps recited in claim 1) the determining steps recited in this claim 3 occurs.
   ii The term "determining" is vague and indefinite.
      (1) Notice that the basis on which the determining is made is not clear.
   iii The term "invalid" is vague and indefinite.
      (1) Notice that it is not clear whether:
         (a) the invalidity is due to binary data error in the certificate or
         (b) the certificate is not authentic.
   iv The ultimate purpose for which the step recited in this claim 3 is done is not clear.
      (1) Notice that a result of the determining step recited in this claim 3 is not being used for any purpose.

d. With regard to claim 4:
   i This claim depends on claim 3 and thus inherits the problem of indefiniteness therefrom.

e. With regard to claim 5:
   i The ultimate goal for which the new certificate is requested by the requesting step recited in this claim 5 is not clear.
   ii From whom/where a new certificate corresponding to an invalid certificated can be requested is not clear.

f. With regard to claim 6:
   i This claim 6 is incomplete since the step of updating recited in this claim 6 is not cooperating with any other steps recited earlier in the parent claim 1.
      (1) Notice that critical steps appear to be missing from this claim 6 since:
         (a) it is not clear how the other steps recited in the parent claim are affected by the updating step or how they affect the updating step.

g. With regard to claim 7:
   i From whom/where one or more new certificate(s) can be requested is not clear.

h. With regard to claim 8:
   i This claim 8 is incomplete since the steps of determining and replacing recited in this claim 8 is not cooperating with any other steps recited earlier in the parent claim 1.
      (1) Notice that critical steps appear to be missing from this claim 8 since:
         (a) it is not clear how the other steps recited in the parent claim 1are affected by the steps recited in claim 8 or how they affect the steps recited in claim 8.
   ii It appears that claim 8 does not further limit the method of claim 1.
      (1) Notice that the limitations recited in this claim 8 is diverged into different steps that are not related to the steps which have been recited in claim 1.

i. With regard to claim 9:
   i The phrase "said distributed key-store" lacks antecedent basis.
   ii The ultimate goal for which a selected certificate is requested from a distributed key-store is not clear.
      (1) Notice that there is no result from doing the accessing and requesting steps recited in this claim 9.
   iii This claim 9 is incomplete since the steps of accessing and requesting recited in this claim 9 is not cooperating with any other steps recited earlier in the parent claim 1.
      (1) Notice that critical steps appear to be missing from this claim 9 since:
         (a) it is not clear how the other steps recited in the parent claim 1are affected by the steps recited in claim 9 or how they affect the steps recited in claim 9.
   iv It appears that claim 9 does not further limit the method of claim 1.
      (1) Notice that the limitations recited in this claim 9 is diverged into different steps that are not related to the steps which have been recited in claim 1.

j. With regard to claim 10:
   i The ultimate goal for which the searching step recited in this claim 10 is not clear.
      (1) Notice that the result (if any) of this searching step is not being used.

k. With regard to claim 11:
   i This claim depends on claim 8 and thus inherits the problem of indefiniteness therefrom.

l. With regard to claim 12:
   i This claim depends on claim 8 and thus inherits the problem of indefiniteness therefrom.

m. With regard to claims 13-24 and 25-35:
   i Each of these group of claims 13-24 and group of claims 25-36 are recited in parallel with claims 1-12 and has similar problems of indefiniteness. The applicant is to review and check for those problems.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

   .(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 11, claims 13, 14, 18, 19 and 23 and claims 25, 26, 30, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Reiter et al (6,049,872) in view of Schweitzer et al (6,418,467).**

a. As to claims 1 and 2:
   i Claim 1 claims:
      (1) 1. A key-store method comprising the steps of:
         (a) retrieving
            (i) one or more certificates
            (ii) from a local database;
         (b) determining
            (i) if said any
               1) of said one or more certificates
               2) preexists
                  a) in a pre-selected portion
                     i) of a distributed database; and
         (c) storing
            (i) non-preexisting certificates
               1) of said one or more certificates
            (ii) in said pre-selected portion
               1) of said distributed database.

   ii Claim 2 claims:
      (1) 2. The method of claim 1 wherein
         (a) said pre-selected portion
            (i) of said distributed database
            (ii) comprises
               1) said distributed database.

   iii Claim 11 claims:
      (1) .11. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of
         (a) repeating, for a second local database, the steps of:
            (i) retrieving one or more certificates;
            (ii) determining if said any of said one or more certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and
            (iii) storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.

iv **Reiter et al (6,049,872)** teaches [see for example, Brief Summary Text - BSTX (4); Detailed Description Text –DETX (14), (2); and Claim Text – CLTX (36)]:
- (1) a method comprising the steps of:
  - (a) retrieving/reading
    - (i) information/file/data/code/certificate
      - 1) from a source storage [i.e., a PGP (or POP) key server that is local to a region in the world]; and
  - (b) storing/writing/saving
    - (i) the retrieved information/certificate
    - (ii) into a destination storage [i.e., a database (of PGP certificates) that is maintained by a Path Server].

v However, Reiter does not teach:
- (1) determining/checking
  - (a) where if
    - (i) the information/certificate retrieved from a source storage
      - 1) pre-exist in a destination storage
  - (b) prior to storing the information/certificate into a destination storage.

vi **Schweitzer et al (6,418,467)** teaches [Abstract; Detailed Description Text – DETX (71)]
- (1) prior to updating a database,
  - **(a)** identifying discarding duplications
    - (i) thereby enhancing the efficiency of data repository.

vii It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
- (1) apply the teaching of Schweitzer so as to identify and avoid duplications of information/certificates that are being stored into Reiter's destination storage/database.

viii The skilled person would have been motivated to do this application because:
- (1) Schweitzer teaches that the application of avoiding of the duplications enhances the efficiency of updating a database by gathering information from a plurality of source databases; and
- (2) Reiter's teaching is related to the field of updating database by merging information from a plurality of sources into a consolidated database.

b. As to claims 13, 14 and 23 and claims 25, 26 and 35:

i Claims 13, 14 and 23 and claims 25, 26 and 35 are listed in parallel with claims 1, 2 and 11 for ease in inspection.

(1) 1. A key-store method comprising the steps of: (a) retrieving one or more certificates from a local database; (b) determining if said any of said one or more certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and (c) storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.	(4) 13. A computer program product embodied in a tangible storage medium, the program product for managing a key-store, the program product including a program of instructions for performing the steps of: (a) retrieving one or more certificates from a first local database; (b) determining if said any of said one or more certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and (c) storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.	(7) 25. A data processing system comprising: (a) circuitry operable for retrieving one or more certificates from a first local database; (b) circuitry operable for determining if said any of said one or more certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and (c) circuitry operable for storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.
(2) 2. The method of claim 1 wherein (a) said pre-selected portion of said distributed database comprises said distributed database.	(5) 14. The program product of claim 13 wherein (a) said pre-selected portion of said distributed database comprises said distributed database.	(8) 26. The system of claim 25 wherein (a) said pre-selected portion of said distributed database comprises said distributed database.
(3) 11. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of (a) repeating, for a second local database, the steps of: (i) retrieving one or more certificates; (ii) determining if said any of said one or more certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and (iii) storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.	(6) 23. The computer program product of claim 13 wherein said program of instructions further comprises instructions for the step of repeating, for a second local database, the steps of: retrieving one or more certificates; (a) determining if said any of said one or more (b) certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and (c) storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.	(9) 35. The system of claim 25 further comprising circuitry operable for repeating, for a second local database, the steps of: (a) retrieving one or more certificates; (b) determining if said any of said one or more certificates preexists in a pre-selected portion of a distributed database; and (c) storing non-preexisting certificates of said one or more certificates in said pre-selected portion of said distributed database.

ii These claims 13, 14 and 23 and claims 25, 26 and 35 have limitations that are similar to those of claims 1, 2 and 11. These claims 13, 14 and 23 and claims 25, 26 and 35 are thus rejected with the same rationales applied against claims 1, 2 and 11.

c. As to claims 6 and 7:

i Claim 6 claims:

(1) 6. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of

(a) updating

(i) said distributed database

(ii) in response to an update event.

ii Claim 7 claims:

(1) 7. The method of claim 6 wherein

(a) said step of updating said distributed database

(i) comprises the steps of:

1) requesting one or more new certificates; and

2) adding said new certificates to said distributed database.

iii Reiter teaches:

(1) updating a destination database, which updating:

(a) is inherently in response to an update event (since such updating must be triggered by a control signal as it is well known in the art that computer operations are controlled by control signals); and

(b) inherently requires a new certificate be:

(i) made available from a source database and

(ii) written into a destination database.

d. As to claims 18 and 19 and claims 30 and 31:

i Claims 18 and 19, claims 30 and 31 are listed in parallel with claims 6 and 7 for ease in inspection.		
(1) 6. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of updating said distributed database in response to an update event. (2) 7. The method of claim 6 wherein (a) said step of updating said distributed database comprises the steps of: (i) requesting one or more new certificates; and (ii) adding said new certificates to said distributed database.	(3) 18. The program product of claim 13 wherein said program of instructions further comprises programming for performing the step of updating said distributed database in response to an update event. (4) 19. The program product of claim 18 wherein said step of updating said distributed database comprises the steps of: (a) requesting one or more new certificates; and (b) adding said new certificates to said distributed database.	(5) 30. The system of claim 25 further comprising circuitry operable for updating said distributed database in response to an update event. (6) 31. The system of claim 30 wherein said circuitry operable for updating said distributed database comprises: (a) circuitry operable for requesting one or more new certificates; and (b) circuitry operable for adding said new certificates to said distributed database.

ii These claims 18 and 19 and claims 30 and 31 have limitations that are similar to those of claims 6 and 7. These claims 18 and 19 and claims 30 and 31 are thus rejected with the same rationales applied against claims 6 and 7.

5. Claims 3-5, 15-17 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Reiter et al (6,049,872) and Schweitzer et al (6,418,467) as applied to claims, 1, 13 and 25 above, and further in view of either Van Renesse (6,529,953) or common practice in the art**

a. As to claim 3:
   i Claim 3 claims:
      (1) .3. The method of claim 1
         (a) further comprising the step of
            (i) determining if
               1) said one or more certificates
                  a) is invalid.

   ii In case if a certificate is checked to see whether it is correctly signed an a certification authority:
      (1) **Van Renesse (6,529,953)** teaches [see Detailed Description Text – DETX (28), (29)]
         (a) determining,
            (i) prior to updating a certificate,
            (ii) if
            (iii) a certificate is invalid/"correctly signed".
   iii In case if a certificate is checked to see whether it is in error:
      (1) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
         (a) check the information being read out from a storage, (whether the read information being a certificate or any other type of information), for error before further handling that read information; and
         (b) to realized that in a reliable memory reading apparatus, an error detection is provided for detecting the invalidity of the information being read out.
      (2) The skilled person would have been motivated to:
         (a) check retrieved information for error because:
            (i) it is **a common practice in the art** to make sure that read information:
               1) can be corrected if the read information has error and
               2) if has errors and cannot be corrected, then ignore it (or else it will be used and result in an error);
            (ii) it is **a common practice in the art** of memory/storage/database error detection to include an error detection to detect error in the information being read from a memory/storage/database.

b. As to claim 4:
   i Claim 4 claims:
      (1) .4. The method of claim 3 wherein
         (a) said step
            (i) of storing
               1) non-preexisting ones
                  a) of said one or more certificates
            (ii) is bypassed
               1) for invalid certificates.

   ii It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
      (1) bypass a step of storing/writing a set of information into a storage/memory/database if the set if determined to be invalid.
   iii The skilled person would have been motivated to do such bypassing because it in **a common practice in the art** to not store invalid information.

c. As to claim 5:

i Claim 5 claims:

(1) .5. The method of claim 3

(a) further comprising the step of

(i) requesting

1) a new certificate

2) corresponding to an invalid certificate.

ii It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) request for valid piece of information, (whether the piece of information being a certificate or any other type of information), if so desired in case a provided piece of information is invalid.

iii The skilled person would have been motivated to request for another piece of information if a provided piece is invalid because:

(1) such request is **a common practice in the art** (as it is well known, e.g., in the art of request for retransmission of invalid information/data/file).

d. As to claims 15-17 and 27-29:

i Claims 15-17 and 27-29 are listed in parallel with claims 3, 4 and 5 for ease of inspection.

(1) 3. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of determining if said one or more certificates is invalid.	(4) 15. The program product of claim 13 wherein said program of instructions further comprises programming for performing the step of determining if said one or more certificates is invalid.	(7) 27. The system of claim 25 further comprising circuitry operable for determining if said one or more certificates is invalid.
(2) 4. The method of claim 3 wherein (a) said step of storing non-preexisting ones of said one or more certificates is bypassed for invalid certificates.	(5) 16. The program product of claim 15 wherein (a) said step of storing non-preexisting ones of said one or more certificates is bypassed for invalid certificates.	(8) 28. The system of claim 27 wherein (a) said circuitry operable for determining if said one or more certificates is expired includes circuitry operable for bypassing, for invalid certificates, said circuitry operable for storing non-preexisting certificates.
(3) 5. The method of claim 3 (a) further comprising the step of requesting a new certificate corresponding to an invalid certificate.	(6) 17. The program product of claim 15 wherein said program of instructions further comprises programming for performing the step of requesting a new certificate corresponding to an invalid certificate.	(9) 29. The system of claim 27 further comprising circuitry operable for requesting anew certificate corresponding to an invalid certificate.

ii These claims 15-17 and 27-29 have limitations that are similar to those of claims 3-5. These claims 15-17 and 27-39 are thus rejected with the same rationales applied against claims 3-5.

6. Claims 8 and 12, claims 20 and 24 and claims 32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Reiter et al (6,049,872) and Schweitzer et al (6,418,467) as applied to claims, 1, 13 and 25 above, and further in view of either Lomet et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,212,788) or Carey et al (6,584,475)**

a. As to claims 8 and 12:
   i Claim 8 claims:
      (1) 8. The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of:
         (a) determining if
            (i) a current certificate
               1) supercedes
                  a) a preexisting certificate; and
         (b) replacing
            (i) said preexisting certificate
            (ii) with said current certificate
            (iii) if said current certificate
               1) supercedes
                  a) said preexisting certificate.
   ii Claim 12 claims:
      (1) 12. The method of claim 8 wherein said distributed database comprises a logical key-store.
   iii Official notice is hereby taken that it is a common practice in the art to:
      (1) update an database entry when an incoming element supercedes an previously existing one.
   iv It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
      (1) replace
         (a) a preexisting certificate of Reiter et al
         (b) with a current certificate
         (c) if the current certificate
            (i) supercedes
               1) the preexisting certificate.
   v The skilled person would have been motivated to do such replacing because:
      (1) it is a common practice in the art; and
      (2) as examples for such common practice:
         (a) **Lomet et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,212,788)** teaches [Detailed Description Text - DETX (3)],
            (i) in System and method in distributed computer databases,
            (ii) "Furthermore, each datum or record 120 in the distributed database is time-stamped, which means that along with the datum or record is stored a consistent set of time values indicative of the order in which the values in those records were last updated. In addition, to the current values of the records stored in the database, the database preferably also stores old versions of records 122 which have since been updated. By storing data that has been superceded by updated values, the database enables one to determine the status of the database at any specified time in the past;" and
         (b) **Carey et al (6,584,475)** teaches [Brief Summary Text - BSTX (4)]:
            (i) "Each generation includes one or more pages (or records) which provide the various values of the database table columns. A page is a unit of allocation, typically 4 k bytes or 8 k bytes, by which the information within the database is made available to a user. As updates are made to the database, these pages are superceded by subsequent versions of the page that reflect the changes made by the most recent update. In some instances, a difference between a new generation and its immediate predecessor may be a single change in one of these pages--the remaining records which make up the two generations remaining identical."

b. As to claims 20 and 24 and claims 32 and 36:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">i Claims 20, 24 and claims 32 and 36 are listed in parallel with claims 8 and 12 for ease of inspection.</td></tr>
<tr><td>(1) 8. The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of:
(a) determining if a current certificate supercedes a preexisting certificate; and
(b) replacing said preexisting certificate with said current certificate if said current certificate supercedes said preexisting certificate.

(2) 12. The method of claim 8 wherein said distributed database comprises a logical key-store.</td><td>(3) 20. The program product of claim 13 wherein said program of instructions further comprises programming for performing the steps of:
(a) determining if a current certificate supercedes a preexisting certificate; and
(b) replacing said preexisting certificate with said current certificate if said current certificate supercedes said preexisting certificate.

(4) 24. The computer program product of claim 20 wherein said distributed database comprises a logical key-store.</td><td>(5) 32. The system of claim 25 further comprising:
(a) circuitry operable for determining if a current certificate supercedes a preexisting certificate; and
(b) circuitry operable for replacing said preexisting certificate with said current certificate if said current certificate supercedes said preexisting certificate.

(6) 36. The system of claim 32 wherein said distributed database comprises a logical key-store.</td></tr>
</table>

ii These claims 20 and 24 and claims 32 and 36 have limitations that are similar to those of claims 8 and 12. These claims 20 and 24 and claims 32 and 36 are thus rejected with the same rationales applied against claims 8 and 12.

7. Claims 9 and 10 , Claims 21 and 22 and claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Reiter et al (6,049,872) and Schweitzer et al (6,418,467) as applied to claims, 1, 13 and 25 above, and further in view of either McGauley et al. (US-PAT-NO: 5,899,998).**

a. As to claims 9 and 10:
   i Claim 9 claims:
      (1) 9. The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of:
         (a) accessing said distributed key-store; and
         (b) requesting a selected certificate from said distributed key-store.
   ii Claim 10 claims:
      (1) 10. The method of claim 9 further comprising the step of
         (a) searching
            (i) a local key-store
            (ii) for said selected certificate
            (iii) in response to a failure of said step of requesting said selected certificate.
   iii **McGauley et al. (US-PAT-NO: 5,899,998),** in his method and system for maintaining and updating computerized records, teaches [see Detailed Description Text - DETX (132)]:
      (1) "Although
         (a) the presently preferred distributed database architecture
            (i) is relatively fail-safe on its own
               1) because
                  a) it
                     i) distributes the data independently throughout the system and
                     ii) does not rely on a central station or masterfile,
         (b) the administrative services system's database
            (i) can be used
               1) to backup
                  a) the distributed PDC and POS databases when necessary."
   iv It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
      (1) apply the concept taught by McGauley to use Reiter's destination database as to backup database for backing up Reiter's source databases.
   v The skilled person would have been motivated to do such application because:
      (1) MrGauley teach that the administrative system's database (relatively local to the PDC and POS databases) can be used for backing up those PDC and POS databases when necessary (e.g., if they would fail); and
      (2) it is expected that the source databases (such as that of Reiter) is prone to failure sometime like any other electronic components.

b. As to Claims 21 and 22 and claims 33 and 34:

i Claims 21 and 22 and claims 33 and 34 are listed parallel with claim 9 and 10 for ease of inspection:		
(1) 9. The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: (a) accessing said distributed key-store; and (b) requesting a selected certificate from said distributed key-store.	(3) .21. The program product of claim 13 wherein said program of instructions further comprises programming for performing the steps of: (a) accessing said distributed database; and (b) requesting a selected certificate from said distributed database.	(5) .33. The system of claim 25 further comprising: (a) circuitry operable for accessing said distributed database; and (b) circuitry operable for requesting a selected certificate from said distributed database.
(2) 10. The method of claim 9 further comprising the step of (a) searching a local key-store for said selected certificate in response to a failure of said step of requesting said selected certificate.	(4) .22. The program product of claim 21 wherein said program of instructions further comprises programming for performing the step of (a) searching a local key-store for said selected certificate in response to a failure of said step of requesting said selected certificate.	(6) .34. The system of claim 33 further comprising circuitry operable for (a) searching a local key-store for said selected certificate in response to a failure of said step of requesting said selected certificate.

ii These claims 21 and 22 and claims 33 and 34 have limitations that are similar to those of claims 9 and 10. These claims 21 and 22 and claims 33 and 34 are thus rejected with the same rationales applied against claims 9 and 10.

99

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ly V. Hua whose telephone number is (703) 305-9684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vu Kim, can be reached on 703-305-4303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ly V. Hua
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2135

Lvh
June 22, 2004